



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,076	07/13/2005	Kai Eck	DE030024US1	8935
24737 7590 03/25/2009 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER ZEILBERGER, DANIEL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2624				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/25/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/542,076

Applicant(s)

ECK, KAI

Examiner

DANIEL ZEILBERGER

Art Unit

2624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DANIEL ZEILBERGER.

(3) _____.

(2) THOMAS KOCOVSKY (REG. NO. 28,383).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Seeley et al. (US Patent 6,484,049).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the Examiner's interpretation of the limitation "providing a pattern of marking elements that are individually not visibly evident to a computer system and to a human viewer of the diagnostic image". The Applicant asked for the Examiner's opinion of various possible amendments, to which the Examiner commented but no agreement was reached as to precise claim language.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Daniel Zeilberger/
Examiner, Art Unit 2624

/Vikram Bali/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624